

**DDDS GAC CMS Medicaid Residential Work Group Transcription**  
**June 4, 2015            1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**Work Group Members Present:** Eddi Ashby, Kathie Cherry, Jamie Doane, Lisa Green, Kyle Hodges, Gary Mears, Bill Monaghan, Kimberly Reinagel-Nietubicz (towards end of meeting), Victor Schaffner, Melida South, Laura Waterland, and Libby Cusack.  
**Missing:** Tim Brooks, Pat Jordan, and Terry Olson.

**Non-Work Group Members Present:** Michelle Dwyer, Micki Edelsohn, Lisa Elias, Jane Gallivan, Carol Kenton, Daniese McMullen-Powell, Barbara Monaghan, Lauri Nicoli, and Jamie Wolf.

**Male Speaker:** Meeting is open, announce your name when you are speaking and speak up. One person talks at a time. Limit phone calls during meetings. Meetings will start and end on time, stay on agenda, do the homework prior to meetings, review documents, guest may participate in meetings, but only committee members may vote. Please make sure you say your name very loudly because it's being recorded and public comments are welcomed at any time on the meeting, we do have public guests. Now well discuss -- the e-mail --

**Female Speaker:** Before we get started -- this is Libby, before we get started with everything going on down the street I was hoping we can take a minute of silence if you don't mind. Thank you. Does everything have a copy of Kyle's e-mail? Jane is going to join us at some point this morning -- Kyle if you want to start us off and just for the rolling, if you can speak up and maybe just read through each part as you go through it.

**Male Speaker:** Well, this is Kyle, and I wasn't necessarily going to go over every aspect of the e-mail, I think everybody has been copied on it and seen it, what I was going to do is probably propose three questions that may address the issues. That were outlined in the e-mail. If that's okay, I do appreciate that the committee is willing to listen to these and I appreciate Libby's communication while I was unable to attend. That's the format I was looking at, but I will take any kind of suggestions that you may want.

**Female Speaker:** Go for it.

**Male Speaker:** Okay. And again, I know some of these issues were addressed at previous meetings and in my humble opinion I don't know if the first two I'm going to talk about was adequately addressed, I'm looking at this really from taking and suggesting the questions based on the CMS rule and guidance. So you know, the CMS guidance talks about that there are settings that are presumed to have institutional quality and don't meet the requirements for -- for that question and in Tennessee also includes this in their assessment is that the question would be, is the setting located in a building on the grounds of immediately adjacent to a public institution, so I can either go overall three question and discuss, or we can discuss it one at a time.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, get three questions and then discuss them.

**Male Speaker:** The second is in a context that the -- it talks about settings that may have the affect of ice lighting individuals with disabilities and it proposing two questions I'm just recommending one -- are individuals who reside primarily, are individuals who reside in the setting, primarily or exclusively people with disabilities? And then the third question and do admit on this one this one was addressed in previous meetings

regarding the proximity issue and I do realize that DDDS has already kind of identified that they will be looking at this in the overall assessment.

(Person Coughing)

**Male Speaker:** General question in there saying something consisted with are multiple settings designed specifically with people with disabilities located in a a close proximity and DDDS can define what close proximity is. So those are the -- three questions that I am putting out on the table. And again, I appreciate the committees consideration.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, can you read through first one again.

**Male Speaker:** The question?

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** Is the setting located in a building on the grounds of or immediately adjacent to the public institution? And it current is one and I know DDDS is working on that, and of as the status at this time doesn't currently exist.

**Female Speaker:** Would anybody like to comment.

**Male Speaker:** Thinks Victor, I think it would be appropriate to add that question to the assessment.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, I think it would be appropriate to add that question.

**Female Speaker:** So it keep this moving forward let's make a vote for committee members, if you would like to keep that question as Kyle mentioned it is the setting located on the grounds of or adjacent to the grounds of the institution raise your hands please 6 say yes, and if you are a no raise your hand. And I think we have how many committees members we have here? 1,2,3,4, five, six, seven, eight, nine, is that right, nine committee members.

**Female Speaker:** Did you count lee is a so six out of ten.

**Female Speaker:** And the CMS rule talks about they may have the affect of isolating individuals and they proposed in their guidance to questions on suggests one and that would be are individuals who reside in setting primarily or exclusively people with disabilities.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, this wasn't paired with that first question.

**Male Speaker:** No.

**Female Speaker:** This is a separate.

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Female Speaker:** Read that again please.

**Male Speaker:** Are individuals who reside in the setting primarily or exclusively people with disabilities?

**Female Speaker:** And this is Libby, where did you get that question Kyle.

**Male Speaker:** From the guidance on settings that -- receiving.

**Female Speaker:** Exploratory questions.

**Male Speaker:** Some of the materials that were passed, out in the beginning when we started this process.

**Female Speaker:** CMS --

**Female Speaker:** What question is it in the exploratory question.

**Male Speaker:** I can read exactly what it says but it's consistent.

**Female Speaker:** I'm wondering if we have that, did you read through questions that we included.

**Male Speaker:** Yeah, it's not in there.

**Female Speaker:** So it was a question that we went through before and it was revised.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, I don't see it anywhere from what I can tell.

**Female Speaker:** Are individuals who reside in the setting primarily or exclusively are people with disabilities.

**Male Speaker:** Yes.

**Female Speaker:** Does anybody have any comments or questions.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, I was reading what we did last week and we talked about sharing, having room rates, sharing rooms, defining a couple and I kind of was having like could someone come and move in there because -- is this related, I was having a hard time after we wrote that question and I thought about it later, you remember what I'm talking about, how we defined add coupled.

**Female Speaker:** You said married.

**Female Speaker:** Married, not married.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, are you asking if someone can move in with somebody?

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** I think this question again, it's an assessment looking at the current situation so when the providers, whoever it is going through assessment process, you are just asking the question regarding that particular time and again, that's why I'm suggesting this question. I don't think it's looking at whether certain situations are going to happen or not, as we go through assessment process is it happening.

**Female Speaker:** So this is Jaime, so you are saying what is it now, what are we looking at.

**Male Speaker:** Right, I think that's the whole assessment.

**Female Speaker:** Jaime, probably I said to myself, I understand, I think you have clarified that.

**Male Speaker:** Okay. Thank you.

**Female Speaker:** I have a question. I'm Michelle, I'm a parent, are you talking about location, with where houses are located.

**Male Speaker:** No. I'm talking --

**Female Speaker:** I need clarification.

**Male Speaker:** Right, I understand. It's not talking location, it's saying that the settings that currently exist, do those settings and the people that reside there, are they primarily or exclusively people with disabilities.

**Female Speaker:** Kyle, this is Libby, I don't understand that question, as related to this because we are talking four specific settings that we know are people with disabilities and I'm not trying to be anything but.

**Male Speaker:** I understand.

**Female Speaker:** We're talking group homes, supported apartments.

**Male Speaker:** Right.

**Female Speaker:** So we know there are people who qualify for services through DDS and this question is saying are they primarily or exclusively people with disabilities, shouldn't the answer be yes.

**Male Speaker:** I mean, it's a question to still S I think CMS is looking to see get a landscape of what's going on in the state -- and I think again, consistent with the guidance is that you know, they want this question to be asked.

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, I looked at this question and trying to figure out what they are trying to get out -- I think what they are trying to get out is a situation where there's -- it's when you parent with the other question pair it with the other question -- the first question that he was going to ask and decided not to, he didn't think it was relative, was it designed exclusively as a setting for people with disabilities, meaning is it not integrated, is it a by itself, is it among the only other residents around are also for people with disabilities, but it's like trying to get at is it exclusively and solely for people with disabilities or is it among settings that are not designed that way.

**Female Speaker:** The way it reads to me is are the individuals who reside in that house or apartment.

**Female Speaker:** I don't think that's what they are trying to get at.

**Female Speaker:** I don't know what you are trying to get at.

**Female Speaker:** I hear you, this is Laura, maybe it needs to be rephrased slightly.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, as Laura mentioned I was kind of looking, they say is the set being designed specifically for people with disability and then go onto say the question -- I was kind of streamline it and make it one, but both questions need to be included to help clarify the situation.

**Male Speaker:** This is Victor. I agree with Laura, I think CMS is getting at the issue with certain --

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, it's ashame we didn't have these three questions in advance so we could have looked at the them, I would have done research to see how it relates to the explore tear question.

**Male Speaker:** -- again.

**Female Speaker:** I'm not finished yet, with that Kyle if you would like to continue discussion that's fine, at some point I would like to take a vote and move on, Kyle if you have anything else.

**Male Speaker:** People had these materials and I'm just bringing them up now, but they were kind of in the material from the beginning.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, that is correct, we are focused on the Delaware document at this point and when we look add the the combined document we had all of the CMS exploratory questions, all of the questions from the basic element review tool from CMS all of the questions from Connecticut, Pennsylvania.

**Male Speaker:** Tennessee.

**Female Speaker:** South and North Dakota, so we have already gone through four state and two CMS documents full of questions, that's what I thought we were focusing on that these documents would incorporate them.

**Male Speaker:** In the Tennessee assessment it has those two questions in it.

**Female Speaker:** And we discussed those questions during the meet.

**Male Speaker:** Is this is Kyle, I'm okay to go ahead and take a vote, I don't think those questions were discussed.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, I think Jaime would like to speak.

**Female Speaker:** I thought I was just discussing an example in Delaware --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** We weren't allowed because it was considered a -- setting that's what Kyle is talking about where I think I live in an apartment --  
(Inaudible)

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, I'm talking about the assessment is for occurring situations, if somebody is going to build something, it's about a current situation, I think this is again, these questions are appropriate for the current situation in Delaware.

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, I understand people in Delaware may know -- people outside of the state may not know that, people from CMS.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, it's an assessment, there are going to be questions that are answered yes and no, I would ask why would anybody not want to answer the question.

**Female Speaker:** I'm sorry Kyle, this is Melinda south, part of the reason is I think it's hard to determine what they are getting at, I think that's the confusion, if you do look at the question in two parts, do you live in a neighborhood living arrangement and the are your roommates do they have a disability, at that point you would say yes, they do, that's what the system is, this is what the Medicaid funded for these people in the setting, it's trying to say is this person live nothing a treatment facility, something like marry Campbell are there people moving here in this medical facility, receiving the funding specifically for this. I'm kind of getting at the independent of this, but I think the question is not very clear and I think that providers will have a difficult time determining and I think we would need to determine what the essence of the question is before we put it in the document.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle. I'm just a little confused about why it's confusing. Especially the one question are individuals who reside in the setting primarily or exclusively people with disabilities is a fairly straightforward question.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby -- you mentioned that you didn't think we gave this enough time when we discussed on April 30th, the meet you were not able to attend, we did have a discussion on page 30 of the transcript, on April 30th, Anderson said these situations were going to be included in the look behind, and for a couple of minutes and then that's kind of how that discussion was wrapped up that day.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, I agree I know it was discussed, I don't think that it was taken, I don't think that it should be in the look behind, I think it should be in an up front question, and I'm okay with going ahead and taking a vote, so you don't have to prolong the discussion unless anybody has another comment.

**Female Speaker:** Before we take a vote Eddy is there anything from a DDDS perspective before we take a vote?

**Male Speaker:** I think it is a question that is interesting in terms of interpretation. I think in the context, reading one question out of context of that whole piece of guidance is challenging, you have to read the whole thing to get the intent of the question. The question is really not, is everybody living in the home have a disability, it's really, is the setting a place where other exclusively designed for people with disabilities, that's what they are trying to get to T if you go out to look at a home, we know everybody living there has a disability, the question is the home situated in a setting that provides opportunity for interaction with people who are not disabled I think that's, if you read through all of that guidance, I think that's what they are getting out throughout the whole document, maybe that question is art any put together to capture it, it could be interpreted it differently, that's what the overall intent is.

**Male Speaker:** : I just want to follow up --

**Female Speaker:** Laura if you can say your name and talk louder.

**Female Speaker:** I want to follow up on what director gal van said that's my understanding of the intent of the regulation is, and I can see a misapplication of a question like this particularly applied in a group home setting where in fact a home may in fact, be working in a way to fully intergrade itself in terms of the surrounding community and be in full compliance with the CMS regulation or an apartment in fact maybe intergrading itself into the community and be in full compliance with the CMS regulation, but because of art full wording here, maybe putting itself out to look as though it's not and I think that's problematic, when you say it's primarily exclusively or inhabited by people with disability, I think we are turning ourselves upside down and that gives me cause for question.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle. Okay I can understand how maybe after further discussion it get more complicated, would it be possible to look at and we don't have to do that today, I know we are running out of time, but would it be possible to kind of look at a possible rephrasing of this and then go from there.

**Female Speaker:** This is Cathy, Kyle I was looking at the questions we already have and I think we already touch on that a little bit in question five under section G access to the greater community.

**Male Speaker:** I'm sorry what page.

**Female Speaker:** Page six on my printout it's on page six, section G access to the greater community, is the setting in the community among other private residences, isn't that what you are getting at about isolation.

**Male Speaker:** Not necessarily.

**Female Speaker:** And then the next one question six, do all individuals have access to community -- so they are not isolated become out in the country we discussed that kind of set.

**Male Speaker:** I know we did discuss those, I think this is something --  
(Person Coughing)

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, back to the exploratory questions, number 14 page three, the setting does not isolate individuals from individuals not receiving Medicaid in a broader community, the exploratory questions are listed below that in terms of isolating individuals, there are ten questions nine or ten questions and I believe we included most of those questions in our document. That relate directly back to isolating individuals as documented on this exploratory document page three number 14.

**Male Speaker:** I have to go through my big pile.

**Female Speaker:** All of these questions were include and had consolidated that we reviewed, nine bullets regarding isolating individuals from CMS and we included most of those bullets, word Smithed every one of them.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, are they in this.

**Female Speaker:** No, exploratory questions from CMS given out the same day as the other document.

**Female Speaker:** I would like to make a vote --

**Female Speaker:** I think it can be rephrased to make sure it's more clear, I agree the word setting is ambiguous and is it in a setting not -- is the home situated in a setting that is I want to say, not exclusively for people with disabilities -- you can put so is the home situated in a setting that's not exclusively for people with disabilities, that addresses the ambiguity.

**Male Speaker:** I would be satisfied with that.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby I would like to go back to the exploratory questions, regarded isolated individuals, the first question, did individuals.

(Reading from paper)

**Female Speaker:** That's addressing services not addressing the location of the residents.

**Female Speaker:** Is the setting among --

**Female Speaker:** It can still be a setting, it's not out in the middle of the field but it doesn't mean -- it's not answering the question is it.

**Female Speaker:** Okay so Laura so what are you proposing.

**Female Speaker:** Is the home situated in a setting.

**Female Speaker:** You have to slow down.

**Female Speaker:** Is the home situated in a setting that is not exclusively for people with disabilities?

**Female Speaker:** All right.

**Male Speaker:** This is Victor, I like where this is going, but with the phrase in a setting is vague.

**Female Speaker:** Well, the whole setting is what it's about, is this, the whole thing is about setting.

**Female Speaker:** The word setting is not used in any of the nine questions under isolated individuals.

**Female Speaker:** You can -- I don't care we haven't been bound by that in the past and I'm not going to be bound by that now he raised a question about settings.

**Female Speaker:** This is lib by, the reason I bring it up we discussed the ambiguity about setting at every meeting.

**Female Speaker:** We have to use it anyway, a lot of these questions have the word setting, maybe we need a definition for what setting is, in this particular question, it's talking about it's location as a setting in the community. And is it located is it isolated, is it you know, there's no integration of the setting into the larger environment and community or is it integrated. So it's not talking about the people, it's not talking about the people in the facility or in the home or apartment it's talking about the location.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, location put that in there, I think that's what you are saying, not -- and you can say in the location of the setting.

**Female Speaker:** Okay --

**Female Speaker:** This is Michelle a parent, clarification, I want to make sure that individuals are not being excluded if someone has hopes and dreams of living on a functioning farm that we are not taking that away if them, it's all about choice, the individual's choice where they want to live.

**Female Speaker:** Okay this is Libby, we have spent 30 minutes on these two questions already, I would like to take a vote, do we want to vote on these questions right now or continue discussion?

**Male Speaker:** I would like to hear the last phrasing I think you were playing with location.

**Female Speaker:** And Kyle.

**Female Speaker:** Substitute location for setting.

**Female Speaker:** Is the home situated located in a setting that is not exclusively for

people with disabilities?

**Male Speaker:** I'm okay with that again, these recommendations are going to go forward, so.

**Female Speaker:** So let's take a vote committee members.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda south, can you read it again, please.

**Female Speaker:** I can.

**Female Speaker:** Slowly.

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, is the home situated in a location that is not exclusively for people with disabilities?

**Female Speaker:** Say it one more time.

**Female Speaker:** Is the home situated in a location that is not exclusively for people with disabilities.

**Female Speaker:** What's the definition of location.

**Female Speaker:** Within a certain number of miles of another home.

**Female Speaker:** I recommend that -- that word to be geography, this is Jaime, as apposed to outside of the home in a community maybe.

**Male Speaker:** The greater community.

**Female Speaker:** Community.

**Female Speaker:** I'm sorry. I'm just trying to -- this is Melinda south I'm trying to break out where it's different from the other questions with isolation and trying to catch the essence of what Kyle is saying, I don't know if we give an example i.e. atrament center.

**Female Speaker:** Atrament center would not get funded with community based services, we are not funding people in treatment centers, and they are trying to make sure.

**Female Speaker:** That's another question they already asked.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda south again, that's what I thought that first question was paired with -- the question that Kyle pointed out.

**Female Speaker:** I don't think this is addressing the treatment facility, in I C F they don't get this kind of money. I think we can talk about it more and more, but I think it's the deal with is it designed -- is it meant to be and is it constructed and wait and had run as a setting -- exclusively for people with disabilities or, they are related questions, is it amongst situations that are not designed exclusively for people with disabilities.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda south, the one thing, I worked with so many different home ands living situations, if I build a home with a ramp is that going to qualify, it's built to meet somebodies needs and I don't want that to be confused when people come to ask those questions, I think that's why we need the qualifiers or the other questions underneath that give more information I think it's ambiguous.

**Female Speaker:** This is lee is a, if we are having such a hard time figure out what this means, how are the providers and foster people going to understand.

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, it would go under residential setting J somewhere? I'm looking at the draft.

**Female Speaker:** Okay somebody mentioned earlier, DDDS is beginning to have final say, let's take a vote.

**Male Speaker:** I would like to add one more thing, I would be more comfortable having it in there because DDDS will have a final say, there's a greater chance they



might address it and word Smith and track it.

**Female Speaker:** I think we are voting on the last version which was read by Laura, is the home situated in a location that's not exclusively for people with disabilities, if you would like to keep it raise your hand, six out of ten I believe. So it will stay in there.

**Female Speaker:** Move on to the next one.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, this one was actually well addressed before, regarding the proximity issue, I know we talk people with disabilities that and I know DDDS, they were going to include that in their overall assessment, I thought again, it might not be a downside to put in a question there, are multiple settings designed for people with disabilities located in close proximity and then you can have at this point a side note, DDDS will define close proximity.

**Female Speaker:** Again this is Michelle, a parent, why don't we not want people close to each other?

**Male Speaker:** People this is Gary --

**Female Speaker:** The people --

**Female Speaker:** This is Lee is a, people's choices, person centered plan --

**Male Speaker:** Are we focusing on the buildings or proximity --

**Male Speaker:** I think the buildings and settings, approximate close proximity.

**Female Speaker:** It's Michelle again, why are we deifying people the choice as human nature.

**Male Speaker:** I'm not disagreeing with you.

**Female Speaker:** We tend to flock to people who are similar to ourselves, if an individual wants to live with two or three roommates but be want friends surrounding them, I want to make sure we are not denying them choice.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, I agree with you, this is an assessment, this is based on the CMS guidance, they are just looking to see what the landscape of Delaware is, it doesn't mean they don't have a choice, it's just a question.

**Female Speaker:** Kyle would you mind reading it again.

**Male Speaker:** Are multiple setting designed specifically this is Kyle, for people with disabilities located in close proximity. And then you know, DDDS would define close proximity. And again, I don't want to take away the choice, but again, this is something just to assess the current situation in Delaware.

**Female Speaker:** If I can speak up again, it's Michelle, a parent, my daughter has been denied choices because of the close proximity to totally accessible places to live. Because she's in a wheelchair because of close proximity, I wanted to make you aware of that.

**Female Speaker:** When we say it's just a question for the assessment what does that mean? It's a question for what purpose?

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, I think the whole basis of the question is stemming from home instead and what's that all about, do you have buildings close together like an institution would have close together, so they are asking about, is it more like an institution or is it more like a community? Greater community might not have things con regated together, but institutions that's a problem with institutions.

**Female Speaker:** Let's not confuse that with home instead -- that's not home instead and maybe you are talking about ADA.

**Female Speaker:** Laura, home instead -- is the interpretation of the Americans with

disabilities act.

**Female Speaker:** I understand that but home instead also said it's not speaking to institutions, home instead also said that institutions would be appropriate for certain people under certain circumstances so home instead was not a clear statement saying we are getting rid of institutions, let's be clear about what home instead said and what home instead said about choice is what I want to go back to with what Michelle was saying.

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, it's not about individual choice.

**Female Speaker:** It is if we're saying people want to be with friends who also seem to have intellectual or other disabilities and there was an issue of what has been called in Delaware, density or questions of how many people with intellectual disabilities can be within proximity or quote unquote multiple settings and what's been praised closed proximity, my question was, why is this question in -- why are you raising it for purposes of the assessment.

**Female Speaker:** And that was not my --

**Male Speaker:** And this is Kyle, basically because it's in the CMS guidance related to the rule.

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, I think they are trying to assist and identify settings that overly isolate and one of the things, I was looking at New York materials, if you answer the question yes, there are a bunch of settings in close proximity, but you can still establish that never the less the life of the individuals living in that setting, they are integrated in the community, you can respond that way. But they are trying to avoid the situation where -- they -- it's with people with.

(Inaudible) it's a

**Female Speaker:** It's a fine line that you walk, it's difficult for people to grasp, every state is different, what works, the city is different an urban area versus rural, there are a lot of different factors, how do we satisfy these come meeting interest, where do you want people to have the ability to live in the appropriate settings --

**Female Speaker:** So this is Libby, are you talking about full access to the community.

**Female Speaker:** What home instead say Social Security the least restrictive most appropriate setting for each person based on their disability P I agree and I think that's why the CMS -- talks about not focusing on location but on quality. Because as Laura pointed out what may be even getting away from person center planning, when we look at geography, what may be okay in one location, in an urban environment maybe different, in New York which has a -- wall, is completely different than what we have going on in Delaware, so I wouldn't even look to New York as being instructive for anything, but here, I have friend who had horrible programs and issues in New York where they have communities that have risen up against group homes that have been built because New York --

**Female Speaker:** And that's happened in Delaware too.

**Female Speaker:** It happens all the time.

**Female Speaker:** Death threats made against her because she built group homes in communities, they had to call the FBI, this happens it's part of human nature, I'm saying New York is a different animal because of the -- wall, it's different because of geography and it has to be looked at with reference to the location and I think that's specifically why CMS says let's look at quality and not location.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, I think we should move on, we have gone on this subject for too long, we have a lot more to cover.

**Female Speaker:** Thank you.

**Female Speaker:** What would you like to do.

**Male Speaker:** Take a vote and go on.

**Female Speaker:** Go for it.

**Male Speaker:** I'd like to take a vote on this question reread the question please.

**Female Speaker:** Was it the question I originally --

**Female Speaker:** The last one are multiple settings designed -- in a close proximity and DDDS will define close proximity.

**Male Speaker:** So let's take a vote now, everybody for yes?

**Female Speaker:** Well, that's not good.

**Female Speaker:** Now you have to say no.

**Male Speaker:** How about no? Those who voted yes --

**Female Speaker:** Ten?

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Six.

**Male Speaker:** Six.

**Female Speaker:** Okay.

**Male Speaker:** Those against raise your hand.

**Female Speaker:** Jaime, I really don't understand that question. It -- I hope it gets --

**Male Speaker:** Motion carries.

**Female Speaker:** Kyle anything else from your e-mail.

**Male Speaker:** No and I do appreciate everybody taking the additional time.

**Female Speaker:** Before Jane has to leave I was hoping to talk about individual assessments. Jaime -- we spoke about it a few minutes last week, I was wondering if you can talk a few minutes.

**Female Speaker:** I want to thank everyone you are doing a tremendous job, this is not an easy task and a lot of diverse opinions, I appreciate you organizing the group and keeping it moving forward, thank you very much, in terms of the individual assessment, I think that in looking at how well continuously evaluate where we are at, it's not a one shot deal, we don't go out and do -- and say we are good, we have to continuously assure we are in compliance one of the tools we thought we would develop is an individual assessment and the division is committing to developing that assessment, we want to really utilize some of the questions -- they are very much person centered, they are tested, we thought we would take some time to pull the questions that will match part of the assessment that you recommend to us and we are not going to delay the process, CMS is questioning the time frame at this point, that's the only feedback we have to day-to-day, our plan hasn't been approved, just been questioned about taking too long to complete the assessment, I don't believe we can stop the clock, but so well have the provider dot assessment while we construct a participants assessment and then complete over time and then we can use that as comparative data going forward, what we would like to do is have the division approximately that together from the co-indicators project and share it, so you can see what the questions are and see what the intent is. If there's some of you that you would like to participate as we go through, you might be a little tired doing T if you would like to participate, we welcome that, we

would probably put a document together initially working from the co-indicators project and -- then ask for feedback from that point. We'll do that for both residential and day services.

**Male Speaker:** When you say it will be developed over time, can you be more specific.

**Female Speaker:** I'm not going to give an end day, we have a lot, a tremendous amount on our plates, obviously once you complete your work, we have to look at both tools, put it in format, camper it to the CMS, we have to spend time with CMS, the attorney general need to take a look, a lot of this cans will be happening once these tools are developed, we are under a crunch to get them out so the providers can begin their assessment, so we are going to be busy see, so maybe the begunking fall.

**Male Speaker:** You will begin a completion at the end of the year?

**Female Speaker:** That would be optimistic, that would be a good target, I don't want to commit to anything right now, I have a very limited number of people that can work on these types of projects and they have full time jobs doing other things.

**Male Speaker:** Would you be looking to convene a work group similar to this one to provide recommendations.

**Female Speaker:** Yes. I think we want to put the structure together because we don't want to do a lot of duplication, particularly if we are using the national indicators project, we know that's particular for -- participants feedback and satisfaction with their services rather D these have been long tested questionings have been validated so we don't want to divert from that too much so we could really join those two together a little bit.

**Male Speaker:** So there will be staff from DDDS and input from people who might make up something as formal as a work group, after you put the document together -- questions from the N C I and share it with folks and what form would that sharing.

**Female Speaker:** Probably take it to public meetings like we have done with other things, particularly when it's a participant survey, we want to make sure people who are receiving services give feedback, parent advocates and providers and everyone else to get the opportunity to see what's in the document.

**Female Speaker:** Previous two people who are speaking are Victor and Jane.

**Female Speaker:** I'm sorry.

**Female Speaker:** Any other comments before we move on quickly.

**Male Speaker:** It was also discussed last week when we were talking briefly about the self-assessment individual assessment, so many people wondering if the individual perhaps needed assistance in order to provide the input that's being stopped, who would be providing that?

**Female Speaker:** The person that can assist that person best, the family, if they don't have that, a direct support staff that knows them best, that's what we do with the core indicators project as well, we find out who is their closest ally to provide the best information.

**Male Speaker:** What about that person will be an employee of the provider.

**Female Speaker:** That happens.

**Male Speaker:** Can that create a conflict though?

**Female Speaker:** In terms of the information that has been gleamed through core indicators project that has always been, there's a category, does the person inform or is

there someone else informal, the variables is not that strong in terms of what we would consider to be a major concern, so that people are really acting in the person's best interest I guess is what I'm saying.

**Male Speaker:** That's a presumption that the person would be acting in the individual's best interest, but I can envision a number of scenarios that the person is thinking of his employer first.

**Female Speaker:** We do the best we can of getting the person who cares about the individual -- when there is no family involved, then the next person who is closest to the individual are going to be the people who are supporting them. That's the reality.

**Female Speaker:** On that note can we move on please, we have a lot to cover Victor is passionate about the individual assessment and pulled together some of the questions -- so --

**Female Speaker:** I actually saw it on your e-mail, I would be happy to have you join us.

**Male Speaker:** Can I ask one last question, who might head up that part of the assessment.

**Female Speaker:** Probably Fran Anderson when she returns and she's very -- so she's going to be out for a while.

**Female Speaker:** Can I ask, are you getting ready to leave?

**Female Speaker:** I'm late to a meeting now.

**Female Speaker:** That's okay this is more most important.

**Female Speaker:** The lease issue is there any progress on that.

**Female Speaker:** We have a group that's pulled together to look at the lease, we have from this office pat is there, rob by lee, Doug, and I think they were going to reach outline to someone else from the attorney general's office about who really deals with lease, tenant rate issues.

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, so the best thing for us is to ignore that all together.

**Female Speaker:** Let it go.

**Female Speaker:** All right.

**Female Speaker:** I think we would appreciate it if you had thoughts about it.

**Female Speaker:** -- we need to.  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** You don't -- it's asking a lot for you to do that, so we thought to bring in the group, there's representation from the mental health team as well as people from the aging disability team as well. Any other questions? Again, thank you all very much.

**Female Speaker:** Thank you.

**Female Speaker:** Okay. Before we move onto the next agenda item, just for the transcript I want to make a note that Kimberly and pat Jordan were planning to call into the meeting today and the phone is not working so those two were supposed to be here and we're not able to participate because of the phone issues, we move onto the agenda, next is the transcript from last week, anybody have anything they would like to try to correct or discuss from last weeks transcript? If not we are going to move onto the Delaware state residential assessment page five, F four. And we're going to move through these quickly. Because everybody should of taken a look at these, three that were voted from last week and hopefully put your thoughts together for the rewrite.

Page five F. under employment number four. Laura do you want to read us what you recommend for that one?

**Female Speaker:** What?

**Female Speaker:** Can you tell us do you agree with number four do you have a suggestion.

**Female Speaker:** I don't think. Let me see. I think we had a conversation on what it meant, but I think the wording is okay.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, I would like to see this question moved to community life.

**Female Speaker:** Okay. Can we define the question first, are we --

**Male Speaker:** The whole question, the whole sentence, do all individuals participants -- meaningful nonwork activities have the choice in integrated community settings?

**Female Speaker:** Bill I agree, I have that same note, I had another suggestion, do all individuals and this is doing it with along the next page that we were supposed to review, H three, do all individuals participate regularly in meaningful activities of their choice such as some of the ones there, in integrated community settings.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, I like to change the question.

**Female Speaker:** Hold on bill. Are there any comments on what I just read first.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, did you say you are trying to combine.

**Female Speaker:** Four and eight -- because I believe they are both trying to get to activities in an integrated community setting. So I was recommending, do all individuals participate regularly in meaningful activities of their choice such as recreational activities, scheduled appointments et cetera, in integrated community settings. No other comments on that bill?

**Male Speaker:** Yes, I would like to say to change the question is do all individuals have a choice to participate in a community such as -- services, schedule, it makes more sense to me to do it that way.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle. I think both questions the way you worded it and the way Libby worded it are very similar and very good, I think they both hit the spot.

**Female Speaker:** I think we got hung up on the words nonwork, I think that should be removed and I think we can move on so bill what was yours.

**Male Speaker:** Do all individuals have choice to participate in the community such as and then shop, attend religious service, schedule appointments, have lunch with family friends, bank, exercise, recreation events in the community that they choose.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, I think that was similar to what you are saying so I think that workings.

**Male Speaker:** Okay.

**Male Speaker:** The word choice and choose so it may be the ability to access these things according to their choice.

**Female Speaker:** I thought bill said do all individuals have the choice to participate --

**Male Speaker:** He did and at the end according to the way they choose or something I'm going by what I heard --

**Female Speaker:** Ability.

**Female Speaker:** Okay Victor.

**Male Speaker:** Libby, I thought you were on the right track with what you had there.

**Female Speaker:** Do all individuals participate regularly in mening full activities of

their choice such as church, banking et cetera, in integrated community settings.

**Male Speaker:** I like that because, you are talking about choice and reality of it, are they participating. It makes it less theoretical than just someone talking do they have the choice I like that.

**Female Speaker:** It's similar to what Bill just read, it should go under community life.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, are we --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** We are removing F four and combining.

**Female Speaker:** Reiterating.

**Female Speaker:** Can I just pick two or three of those examples, somebody have a preference, shopping? Under H three.

**Female Speaker:** Restaurants.

**Male Speaker:** I think --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** All right. So moving on.

**Male Speaker:** Which ones are you choosing Libby? Sounds like you better include.

**Female Speaker:** Shopping, restaurants, what else do you want?

**Female Speaker:** Shop.

**Male Speaker:** Shopping, restaurants, commercial activities.

**Female Speaker:** Shopping, banking? Er sizing? We talked about food a lot, how about exercising?

**Male Speaker:** Sure.

**Female Speaker:** So we are moving F four and combining with H three.

**Female Speaker:** This is Eddy, that's Kimberly, she would like to be called in on the meeting I told her the phone is not working, I will call her in on my personal phone so she can join the meeting.

**Female Speaker:** So next is community life page six H one, can somebody please read the suggestion on that one, page six H one, I will start with Tim's recommendation, he suggested do all individuals regularly access the community? If you don't like that, then turn that question into three questions --

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime -- could we say do all individuals have the choice to regularly access because -- it --  
(Talking at the same time)

**Female Speaker:** Kimberly this is Libby I'm sorry we were not able to get to you, we didn't have a good phone number to contact you, we are on page six of the Delaware assessment, we are talking about H one.

**Female Speaker:** Did you have the conversation about Kyles --

**Female Speaker:** Yes we already had that discussion we took a vote and moved onto the rest of the agenda.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle regarding the H one.

**Female Speaker:** Hold on, Kimberly are you okay or do you want to hear a wrap up.

**Female Speaker:** I would appreciate an update at the end of the meeting.

**Female Speaker:** All right Kyle, H one.

**Male Speaker:** Thank you. Is this a lot different than what we just went over? So do we actually need that as a different question?

**Female Speaker:** I agree it can be deleted. Dozen anybody oppose deleting H one,

all right we are deleting H one. All right next on the agenda, page seven and eight on the Delaware assessment. As I was pulling this together I noticed there was a grouping of questions that we didn't go through. In a consolidated document, if we can go through quickly and hopefully everyone read them and has a opinion and ready to state them so we can move through quickly.

**Male Speaker:** Where are we.

**Female Speaker:** Page seven, needs to be reviewed.

**Female Speaker:** I recommend we delete this.

(Inaudible)

**Male Speaker:** Which one?

**Male Speaker:** I think, this is bill, I think it's important to leave. I disagree.

**Male Speaker:** Do you have any questions about the final rule?

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** I --

**Female Speaker:** Let's take a vote anybody want it is leave it in raise your hand please, delete it raise your hand high, eight, we are deleting South Dakota from the rest of the United States, just kidding.

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Exploratory question 17. Has several bullets.

**Female Speaker:** My suggestion is it's similar to the Hawaii and Connecticut questioners, and I like the Hawaii and Connecticut questions better personally, what are your opinions?

(Person Coughing)

**Female Speaker:** I agree I like those questions better.

**Male Speaker:** I agree that the other questions should be left in there, we should be giving people assistive technology.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, we addressed the technology in other questionings, right now, the questions from Hawaii and Connecticut came from the exploratory questions, so we can't duplicate, my suggestion is can we use the Hawaii and Connecticut questions as apposed to the --

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Now we are taking into account -- all individuals in our.

(Inaudible)

**Male Speaker:** Just to clarify, as Libby said, the assistive technology -- we have that in another section.

**Female Speaker:** So if we can take a vote, if you are okay with deleting the exploratory question 13 and using -- this on the next page raise your hand high. Eight people, we are going to make that change. Moving onto page eight exploratory question one. And those are very similar anybody have --

**Female Speaker:** I think exploratory question is better than the Connecticut.

**Female Speaker:** Twenty-nine, 30, 31.

**Female Speaker:** The wording is complicated.

**Female Speaker:** So these questions are very similar, if you would like to keep exploratory questions under one raise your hand high, nine, majority said to keep exploratory questions, and we are deleting Connecticut -- just for the record I mistaken, we are deleting the first line under South Dakota, deleting explore tear questions 13,



keeping exploratory question one and the bullets, Connecticut 16, deleting Connecticut 29, 30, 31 --

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, in Hawaii, can you say the individual instead of client.

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Female Speaker:** So we are finished with pages seven and eight, going back to pages one and two, I think I included this is Libby, I think I included this in the e-mail, we have not discussed pages one and two and what we would like to include, I took information off of other assessments, just put it on here so we had something to start with, we can change, modify, add or delete. If you don't mind --

**Female Speaker:** Libby, this is DDDS right.

**Female Speaker:** Correct.

**Female Speaker:** So on page two we have to come up with this, I think it's fine. It doesn't need to be more complicated than that.

**Female Speaker:** The overview just came from the DDDS document, I thought if providers haven't read the documentation, actually I was thinking maybe we should include the website where they can find the full document.

**Female Speaker:** Great idea.

**Female Speaker:** And again DDDS can take or leave any of this information so any other comments on page one or page two? Adds changes, deletes? That was too easy, Victor.

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Here we go, let's move on, answer options, what we have been waiting for?

**Female Speaker:** Absolutely.

**Male Speaker:** Where are we.

**Female Speaker:** Answers to the questions who are the options so some states have yes, no, explain. This is.

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, yes, no -- so it might be nice to just --

**Female Speaker:** Be consistent.

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Okay. That's one --

**Female Speaker:** Most states do that too, it seems to be in a lot of the other ones that we see.

**Male Speaker:** Yes, no.

**Female Speaker:** And then an explanation.

**Female Speaker:** Right.

**Female Speaker:** So we simply file.

**Female Speaker:** I agree.

**Female Speaker:** --

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Yes, no or explain or something like that.

**Female Speaker:** Connecticut does that and theirs got approved.

**Female Speaker:** Okay I would like to hear from a residential providers. The two of you, what would make sense from the provider filling out this, guys.

**Female Speaker:** Sorry.

**Female Speaker:** I agree, I think the more simple we can make it, the better

something small provided we explain we have some sort of, some of the questions are going to need to be explained. My bigger concern other than that, and this is Melinda south, the proof aspect and I want to make sure we touch on that before we finish everything.

**Female Speaker:** Okay so are you suggesting yes, no explain.

**Female Speaker:** I'm fine with that.

**Female Speaker:** I'm fine with that as well.

**Male Speaker:** Explain, you are going to get detailed explanations and you are going to get poster children for being vague, so you know I think we should be asking for evidence as well and of course whether that evidence is was strong or not will be determined by folks doing the look behind and others.

**Female Speaker:** This is Lisa, and that's fine, but we have to be careful we can't ask for evidence for everything, there are policies for everything, I have no problem with evidence but I think we have to decide -- trust issues in the provider, sorry about that.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, would it make sense to put something in the instructions around types of information that should be included in the explained section such as evidence of policies or something like that? Instead of adding another line item that says you know, what's your evidence?

**Female Speaker:** Sorry this is Melinda south, and what questions do we feel we need evidence for, if somebody is looking for evidence that people are involved in the community, am I asking everybody to then go through and pull a months worth of note to prove they are in the community, we need to decide what we are going to give them, as Victor said, I can turn in a Bible worth of information on one house, this is not going to make time frames for providers.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, Bill, I don't know if you remember the conversation when we met with Jane last week, she said that she was not looking for all of the detailed documentation listed in the response to the assessment, that that was the job of the look behind but they will take the answers they provide and you said that all four of the people in the group home do X can show you the documentation that proves that.

**Female Speaker:** So based on what Jane said it doesn't sound like we need to gather that detailed information.

**Female Speaker:** When they come to do the look behind, they will be asking for specifics if they don't see what we said in the assessment.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, some of these questions you can choose yes and some of these questions you can choose no, so which ones, this can be confusing for the people, because if they mark no, you will say what the no is, what if the next question is yes and they mark a no, how do they no.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, the evidence line isn't associated with no, I think it's associated with yes or no whatever evidence to prove yes or no.

**Male Speaker:** --

**Male Speaker:** I believe that it's generally true, I believe the folks that are doing the day assessment are coming up with wording along the lines are there written policies documented staff training and performance evaluation systems in place that cover a clear process for supporting clients and achieving increased independence.

**Female Speaker:** That's pretty heavy.

**Female Speaker:** For every question?

**Male Speaker:** I think that's the over arching bar that they need to clear I think that's where they are going.

**Female Speaker:** This is -- there are not policies for over question.

**Male Speaker:** Sure, that's true.

**Female Speaker:** At some point even though there's though trust with you and us, you have to have some -- in the look behind they are going to be doing the look behind and if there are red flags, they will be coming and asking for.

**Male Speaker:** This is Victor, that's not true that I don't have trust, I would be looking to come up with the most accurate assessment possible no matter what the subject of the assessment was I just happen to be doing this about providers here. So that's not true what you said Lisa.

**Female Speaker:** Okay.

**Female Speaker:** So this is Libby is that in the instructions where you just read, where did that paragraph land.

**Male Speaker:** -- told me that this is information as of a couple of days ago before their meeting yesterday, that they were going to have in their document exactly, where I'm afraid I don't know but this is to get at -- to provide examples some of the explanation we were talking about, they are looking for written policies, documented staff training, performance evaluation systems which they feel have a lot of value and you are looking at explanation and evidence.

**Male Speaker:** Did that sound like it came from CMS guidance or he didn't get into that.

**Male Speaker:** I don't know.

**Male Speaker:** It sounds like the policies that you are saying I know that's what they are asking of sils (?) We went over this yesterday, are they looking for a basis -- I guess you can't have a policy for every thing.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda south what you are saying is true, for 90% of them we have a state policy.

**Female Speaker:** That's what we would have to go back to state policy that would be the case --

**Male Speaker:** An explanation.

**Female Speaker:** I -- copy of day services -- and I didn't printout that version I didn't look at it, I think it was the same, I don't see that included on the day services questionnaire that information. The evidence -- I don't know is that something that you still discussing to include?

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** We are talking about the answers to the question, yes, no, explain.

**Female Speaker:** It says on there, under each one, if no, then why. But some of it doesn't.

**Female Speaker:** That's true.

**Female Speaker:** But the question was more about the proof the policies in the person center plans.

**Male Speaker:** There were three areas.

**Male Speaker:** Are there written policies, documented staff training, policies in place that --

**Female Speaker:** Why would you put that Victor? Is that under instructions? As you

explained your answer think about these things or something like that.

**Male Speaker:** It might have a place playing with the wording there in the first page that you put together because as Melinda said, something like this couldn't apply to every single question that we would be going through obviously.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, I mean if we can come up with the right wording, if it's not a requirement for every question to have that information documented, but as you're thinking about the explanation for your yes or no, these are the types of things you should be thinking about. I think something like that.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, someone that is addressing questions I'm wondering should we mark certain questions that we want proof, part of what you read Victor, under part -- dignity and respect question eight, does staff and volunteers receive orientation training and continued education related to registration dents rights, so some of that is addressed throughout, certain questions -- we don't want to know the policy but we want to know have you had training. So should we note what kind of answer yes or no, what kind of proof and then you prove it T you give that --

**Female Speaker:** This is Lisa S these assessments are not only being done by us but by the foster care folks, they are not policy driven like we are.

**Female Speaker:** This is -- they have a standard set of policies that they are required to adhere to from DDDS.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, I'm sure they have to go through training and updating, I'm sure, I understand what you are saying but as I read through this whole document, some answers should be yes, some should be no, how you prove one is a policy, how you prove -- so we want proof of each question.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, just real quick to add onto what Lisa was saying, I was wondering about this earlier, I'm not sure how this works, the supported living arrangements have drop in care -- who's going to be completing the assessment, is that the provider again?

**Female Speaker:** I'm sure the provider will do that.

**Female Speaker:** We have some drop in care --

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, if someone has 20 hours a week to help with the finances, how would they answer the other questions.

**Female Speaker:** They wouldn't be, good point.

**Female Speaker:** So do you want to -- by something.

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Well, do but -- I don't know.

**Female Speaker:** That's a good point because a lot of these questions will not pertain to.

(Person Coughing)

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, so I guess the question is what we have to identify the questions that are similar to the one that you used in the example and make them consistent I guess in some way if possible. Without making this torturous.

**Female Speaker:** If we focus on the responses, answer options, can we agree on something there first?

**Female Speaker:** I agree on yes, no, Jaime, no, at least yes, no.

**Female Speaker:** At least, yes.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, so there's yes, no and explain, and the explain goes

with the yes or no it's not just under no, then we have yes, no N A and explain does anybody have any other --

**Male Speaker:** Because I think if you go a yes, no, explain, I think if you go beyond that, it's going to get confusing to the provider.

**Female Speaker:** Do we want to take a vote on those options at this point.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle can you repeat those please.

**Female Speaker:** Yes, no --

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** So the first option, so we are going to raise our hand if you like option one or two, the first option is yes, no, explain., the second option is yes, no, N/A, explain, so the explain can go with any of that. Let's vote for yes, no, explain first, hold hands up high X Kimberly, you can chime in on your vote there. Yes, no, explain. And I guess we better vote for the second one, and yes, no, explain, N A -- so officially close that guy down.

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, please explain your response whether it's yes or no.

**Male Speaker:** It's supposed to be applicable to all of them.

**Female Speaker:** That's the next step we go back to what Victor was saying, that has to do with the instructions, as far as hutch detail we are looking for. So who wants to try to, Victor do you have another revision that we can for us that being be included in instructions or anybody else.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, are you comfortable, I know you voted yes for the yes, no answer, are you comfortable with yes, no not applicable and please explain?

**Female Speaker:** I think I am, I'm comfortable with that. Yes.

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Are you comfortable --

**Female Speaker:** I don't think there would be many N A's --

**Male Speaker:** Please explain why --

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Explains for all three of them. I'm sorry Kimberly did you want to put your vote in to one of those two.

**Female Speaker:** I'm okay thank you.

**Female Speaker:** The day program, they had a couple of statements here, the provider self-assessment is designed to provide the state with information that would be used to develop measure criteria for -- services in the future to identify -- three identify settings that are presumed not to be HCBS, help providers understand changes needs --

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Sounds good.

**Female Speaker:** What are you proposing?

**Female Speaker:** Just another piece to explain what we are doing, I don't know if all providers are as knowledgeable as these two here.

**Female Speaker:** It's DDDS process, let them explain what it is.

**Female Speaker:** Okay.

**Female Speaker:** That is Laura.

**Female Speaker:** So we can move on, Victor, would you like to suggest or maybe send me what you suggest for the instructions on that and then we can discuss it next

week for a few minutes.

**Male Speaker:** Yes.

**Female Speaker:** Is everybody okay with that.

**Female Speaker:** I'm fine with that.

**Female Speaker:** --

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** This is Laura, are we -- what are we doing.

**Female Speaker:** We are trying to move on. I was saying when I look through this, it seems long, I think there's a lot of room to, maybe we are running out of time, there's a lot of consolidation that can be done. I think we have everything covered I just think there's some you can combine a couple of one question or.

**Female Speaker:** This is lee S I agree, when you look at these, they have one line, where we may have seven, and they are all good questions, I think the point is -- that's a concern.

**Female Speaker:** So what are you suggesting.

**Female Speaker:** Well, I started to go through T I don't know if we have time to do this. Like -- there's three questions about grooming that we can put into one, it's B two, three, four, and five, six, seven, I think two, three, four, I know it's specific questions but I think they can be consolidated, I think the haircut question in C seven can be moved -- I don't know.

**Female Speaker:** Laura, this is Libby, there are still word Smithing that can go on for months, can we fly through rest after the agenda and then come back.

**Female Speaker:** I didn't want to interfere with that.

**Female Speaker:** We have next week as well.

**Female Speaker:** So we still have to come next week?

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Okay. Moving on the agenda, we are going to finish the next couple and come back to the assessment, next is the open action items and the look behind process and who I be completing the look behinds, still working on that, any change with that Eddy.

**Female Speaker:** No.

**Female Speaker:** No change, the update J K L, got the update they are working on that. The next one is what is considered valid proof for evidence of compliance with Delaware -- that's kind of what we were talking about, we will talk about that next week. And Victor is going to provide us with information, settings that's late related questions, I think we covered that in the questions earlier would everybody agree with that.

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Female Speaker:** The next one I have open, the individual assessment, also create an assessment for individuals to complete. I'm going to close that one based on our conversation today.

**Male Speaker:** I didn't hear you.

**Female Speaker:** I'm going to close that based on our discussion.

**Male Speaker:** We can close it but we can also close it by voting on we make a recommendation that DDDS do what Jane said it is going to do.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, I heard her say you were the chairman of -- I heard her say Victor was --

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Laura heard that.

(Laughing)

**Female Speaker:** Do you want to vote?

**Female Speaker:** So I guess for the transcript you want to vote to say whether or not the group is fully recommended.

**Male Speaker:** DDDS also drafting and sending to the CMS an individual assessment.

**Female Speaker:** So -- I guess first we want to take a vote on that, Kimberly can you put us on mute.

**Female Speaker:** Thank you.

**Female Speaker:** Do you want to take a vote on the subject raise your hand, yes?

**Female Speaker:** So let's take a vote, the vote is do we want to recommend to DDDS that we endorse them creating and sending out an individual assessment F yes raise your hand high.

**Female Speaker:** That's not what we said originally, we agreed with the assessment -- but --

(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** We can't tell them what to do --

**Female Speaker:** How did you say it.

**Female Speaker:** I think you are supposed to reinforce that the committee endorses the idea that they do it.

**Male Speaker:** I believe we were voting to endorse Jane's telling us that DDDS is going to go forward in crafting and sending along to CMS an individual assessment.

**Female Speaker:** -- is that.

**Male Speaker:** What was your understanding.

**Female Speaker:** I don't think -- I think they are going to develop an individual assessment is part of the process, I don't know that it has to be -- I don't think it's going to CMS, she wants to send this in like right away in the time frame --

**Male Speaker:** That was clear.

**Female Speaker:** And the assessment would be done probably in the fall, the individual assessment would be created.

**Female Speaker:** So I'm going to close this saying that the majority of our committee endorses DDDS creating and implementing an assessment.

**Female Speaker:** And Victor is the chairman.

**Female Speaker:** That was the last open item in my head, next on agenda, agenda topics for next meeting.

**Male Speaker:** Consolidation, possibly.

**Female Speaker:** Review the assessment.

**Male Speaker:** This is Victor, I would agree with that.

**Male Speaker:** We all go through -- if we get into it too much well never finish it.

**Male Speaker:** This is Victor, it's not a question about what is or is not in the document as it currently stands, have we addressed individual's also having a choice regarding staff?

**Female Speaker:** Choice of provider.

**Male Speaker:** No staff where they reside.

**Female Speaker:** How can they do that?

**Male Speaker:** This is totally different --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Are they trying to expand it.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle -- this is specifically to the --

**Female Speaker:** What do you mean can you explain.

**Female Speaker:** --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** This is -- I think she's talking about giving a choice on all of the providers Jaime --

**Female Speaker:** Jaime wolf.

**Female Speaker:** Yes Jaime wolf, I'm sorry.

**Male Speaker:** The draft in the thing, the deadline is next week.

**Male Speaker:** To answer the question you are getting at, I mean, what we're going forward on in this assessment is that people have a choice of roommate, they are supposed to be given a choice of a provider, this is another level within that provider, do they have a choice of staff as far as it can be P T's, O T, the person --

**Female Speaker:** That's different like having choice of medical providers, but if you are -- I'm not going to talk for you, there's only so far as you can go as far as controlling what a provider can provide.

**Female Speaker:** I mean, I can say, they should have a choice in terms of who they see as a physician or these other areas, but you have a choice of provide every, but the providers -- employees, independent contractors, I don't know if that's workable.

**Female Speaker:** I have a question -- like say if someone was in the hospital and needed in home physical they were, can they choose between --

**Female Speaker:** I think they could.

**Female Speaker:** They do.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, if you look at page five you aren't E.

**Female Speaker:** This is Lisa. I'm agreeing I think Victor is saying here, if somebody is not happy with their direct support professional, can they voice their concerns?

**Male Speaker:** Voice concerns and have a real choice about having someone else.

**Female Speaker:** Yeah, in the past we have had people who don't like a staff person for some reason, we yes, because we tell our staff that you are working for those individuals and we move them to different houses, but it's not always possible.

**Male Speaker:** This is Gary, E four, it's kind of a board statement, are all individuals -- is that what fits under there as one of the examples?

**Female Speaker:** Hi -- actually, Victor, your question is right on, I asked that specific question to Melinda before and apparently there is a way to do that, but there are complications, but it's very different than the other questions, you are asking about the direct support, not the doctors, the P T but what's not covered is your question, can the person who is the primary caretaker for that caregiver, they have a selection process of what they want to have service them, I absolutely agree with them.

**Female Speaker:** They don't always have the selection --

**Female Speaker:** At the end -- are they able to say no.

**Female Speaker:** If there's an issue and not happy with the direct support system, yes, they are to say that, we make every attempt to remove that staff person, we have to look out for the best interest of the resident.



**Female Speaker:** I feel it's important to be part of the employment process before the get placed into the position not at the very beginning, the person you're interviewing for a particular spot, so you go through background check and interview processes and you get down to somebody who you would like to hire in a particular home, but before that person is hired, there should be a confirmation by those that are in the house that they are in fact would like to have this person in their house.

**Female Speaker:** It's not that easy because there's a vacancy tomorrow, there might not be -- and they might not end up at that house, the beginning process makes that complicated.

**Female Speaker:** Is there a choice and you know, we already discussed this and I think it's an important question.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda south, to that, we have them come down, we have perspective people meet the staff person who's coming into the house and they have to agree and for any reason they don't feel comfort, sometimes it's more complicated when you cast the net further out, some people fortunately do have prejudice against certain people the way they look, anything it could be any number of things, so in general, we don't open it up to await net and that's why HR likes to have a firm handle on it so we don't run into employment issues as well, they do go out to the house and we have been more sensitive to parent needs when very appropriate.

**Female Speaker:** This is Lisa, in my brothers agency, mosaic, they have included him and other people in his group home and in the highering process.

**Female Speaker:** That's what you are talking about right?

**Female Speaker:** Okay, so this is Libby, it sounds like this is an important topic to include X as much we want to reduce the number of questions I think we need to add one, can somebody suggest a question to add? Victor you started this, do you have a --

**Male Speaker:** I was going to say if you have something.

**Female Speaker:** Kyle did you have something.

**Male Speaker:** I was agreeing with you no.

**Female Speaker:** It should be simple are all individuals given a choice or in the process of the employment of the people that are hired within the setting.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime -- can we put it under the section B individual initiation Autonomy independence making like choices put it under that section, and given part of the process of hiring, included in the process and being able to.

**Male Speaker:** But I wonder if it should go beyond that, we are talking about everyone having a say in the hiring, that's better than nothing, but somebody has been there for ten year and they have a new person who comes into the home and it's a -- it's clearly the wrong fit and if we just limit it to what was phrased, it would not address the ladder situation.

**Female Speaker:** This is Melinda is, what I was going to say is it we covered some of that when we were talking -- we may want to look back at that.

**Female Speaker:** --

(Inaudible) my daughter is with mosaic and relatively new to them December this pastier, during her E L P meeting, we made it clear to her that if she's not happy with a staff men, she is to go to the house manager and speak directly with them and that -- --

**Female Speaker:** They will discuss what the problem is and the person can possibly be moved. So you know, as a new provider, I was happy to hear that she was given that option, if she has a issue to go to the house manager and speak up.

**Male Speaker:** This is Kyle, could then something as simple as are individuals able to support staff? Is that what we are trying to get at.

(Talking at the same time)

**Female Speaker:** This is a parent, it does get complicated -- one person that discount get along with the staff and the other three do, it's not so easy.

**Female Speaker:** This is bar by, are these questions mainly for providers or individuals, because -- for the emergency preparedness and we filled out a form and the form was so difficult that people with disabilities it was probably hard for them to understand.

**Female Speaker:** This particular form is for the providers.

**Female Speaker:** Okay.

**Female Speaker:** Meaningful input though.

**Male Speaker:** I was thinking maybe we need two questions, where one seems do individuals -- also the idea of change, how did you phrase it Kyle? You said it was simple as.

**Male Speaker:** Are individuals are able to change support staff, it can be complicated, the more you look at it, it's a complicated issue.

**Female Speaker:** This is Jaime, we may have a procedure to -- somebody they don't want to change but maybe it can't be resolved so they want to change the staff so it's not as easy as change a staff men, it could be just -- and work out a difference.

**Female Speaker:** They don't have the authority to hire and fire people.

**Female Speaker:** No, change --

**Female Speaker:** Their voices are heard, I don't know how you want to phrase T their voices are heard, they might not be able to change them, but they miss understand each other, so somebody brings them together and says this is what I need and maybe work things out so it's not.

**Male Speaker:** I think the voices are heard doesn't go merely far enough on this subject, I think the thinking behind this is that should they have to accept this if it's clearly the wrong fit and people who do not receive HCBS, they have a choice at such things, if you bring somebody into your home for this that or the other, you don't like it, it's a bad fit, you have a clear opportunity live nothing a community, to find somebody who you would be the right fit, I think that's what we are trying to get at here.

**Female Speaker:** This is Libby, we are not going to decide on it today, but so we have it on the list for next week, think about it, can I, hold on a second, do they know, do individuals know the process on how to change staff and are they included in the process to change their staff, so they're not making any decisions, do you know how to request it and are they included is what I would suggest, and we can note and further refine next week.

**Female Speaker:** I think you will have one additional piece.

**Male Speaker:** Is there a mediation between the staff and the person --

(Inaudible)

(Talking at the same time)

**Male Speaker:** Is there a mediation in between the staff and the person who lives in

the group home?

**Female Speaker:** Jaime wolf, can there be an objective person if there are four staff and -- and there's two individual staff that just don't get along, is there a mediation process, we can discuss it next week to help them, if the mediation doesn't work, do they go through a multilevel process, because personally --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** Being able to have input on hiring the individuals -- people don't have that home training.

**Female Speaker:** We are running out of time I have three items for further discussion S do the individuals know the process are they included in the process and something about mediation. So I will make a note of those three and let's put that on the agenda for next week.

**Male Speaker:** This is bill, one thing, we need to get this done, can anybody stay until quarter of four today, 15 minutes isn't going, we need to get this put down and into DDDS next week.

**Female Speaker:** Is there a way to extend a little next week if necessary.

**Female Speaker:** Personally no, this is all we have on next weeks agenda, I don't know why we would not be able to complete this next week.

**Male Speaker:** The consolidation with this process about staff and --

**Female Speaker:** Mediation.

**Male Speaker:** And maybe a little tweaking leave and there.

**Female Speaker:** So right now I have to go through document and specifically we'll talk about those three questions and any other agenda items for next week? That's a no I take it, the next meeting is next Thursday, June 11th, same someplace same time 130, if you come up with other agenda items please send them to be by Monday so I can include them on the agenda that I send out on Tuesday.

**Male Speaker:** Is there anyway to do a first draft --  
(Inaudible)

**Female Speaker:** I can give you the third draft tomorrow, well, actually --  
(Laughing)

**Male Speaker:** The yes and no's --

**Female Speaker:** I will do my best to get that out tomorrow. Thank you. Kimberly.

**Female Speaker:** Yes, I apologize for not having you included.

**Female Speaker:** It's okay Libby, I can send you an e-mail and do you want to talk to somebody in particular about, what do we want to do about that conversation, if you can.

**Female Speaker:** If you can send me a summary, I will send it out with the notes from today, if you want to add anything to the agenda next week just let me know.

**Female Speaker:** Okay. Thank you very much, Libby.

**Female Speaker:** Okay, bye.